6B

Action

Legislative Committee

Analyses of Bills

Executive Summary: Staff will present analyses of educator preparation or licensing bills introduced by Legislators. The analyses will summarize current law, describe the bill's provisions, estimate its costs and recommend amendments, if applicable.

Recommended Action: Staff will recommend a position in each bill analysis submitted for the Commission's consideration.

Presenter: Rod Santiago, Consultant, Office of Governmental Relations

Strategic Plan Goal: 4

Continue effective and appropriate involvement of the Commission with policymakers on key education issues.

• Influence legislation regarding the preparation and certification of professional educators

BILL ANALYSIS

Bill Number: Senate Bill 232

Author: Senator Denise Ducheny

Sponsors: Author

Subject of Bill: Subject Matter Projects

Date Introduced: February 14, 2007

Date Last Amended: June 4, 2007

Status in Leg. Process: Assembly Education Committee

Recommended Position: Support

Date of Analysis: July 12, 2007

Analyst: Rod Santiago

Analysis of Bill Provisions

This bill extends the inoperative date of the California Subject Matter Projects (CSMP) from June 30, 2007 to June 30, 2014, and extends the sunset date from January 1, 2008 to January 1, 2015.

Summary of Current Law

Education Code §99200 provides for the establishment and maintenance of CSMP for the purpose of developing and enhancing teachers' subject matter knowledge in the following six specified areas: writing, reading and literature; mathematics; science; history-social science; world history; and international studies. Existing law also establishes the CSMP for the purpose of developing and enhancing teachers' instructional strategies to improve student learning and academic performance as measured against the state's K-12 Academic Content Standards.

Education Code §99200 also establishes a Concurrence Committee whose duties include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (1) Ensuring that the statewide and local subject matter projects comply with requirements of this chapter.
- (2) Developing rules and regulations for the statewide subject matter projects.
- (3) Selecting a contractor for a four-year independent evaluation of the effectiveness of the subject matter projects.

The Concurrence Committee is composed of individuals who are affiliated with leadership, management, or instruction, in education or education policy entities and are selected as follows:

- (1) One representative selected by the Regents of the University of California (UC).
- (2) One representative selected by the Board of Trustees of the California State University.
- (3) Two representatives selected by the State Board of Education, at least one of whom has significant experience with direct classroom instruction.
- (4) One representative selected by the Governor.
- (5) One representative selected by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.
- (6) One representative selected by the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission.
- (7) One representative of the California Community Colleges selected by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.
- (8) One representative of an independent postsecondary institution selected by the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities.

Education Code §99206 makes the CSMP inoperative on June 30, 2007, and is repealed on January 1, 2008.

Education Code §99204 requires the Regents of the UC with the approval of an intersegmental Concurrence Committee to establish and maintain the projects with funds appropriated in the Budget Act.

Education Code §99201.5 authorizes the UC to establish other subject matter projects and prohibits funds allocated in the Budget Act from being used for subject matter projects not specified in law.

Education Code §99202 establishes an advisory board for each subject matter project composed of the following:

- (1) One representative selected by the California Postsecondary Education Commission.
- (2) Two representatives selected by the President of the University of California, one of whom is a member of the faculty in the discipline addressed by the project.
- (3) Two representatives selected by the Chancellor of the California State University, one of whom is a member of the faculty in the discipline addressed by the project.
- (4) Three representatives selected by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, one of whom is a classroom teacher in the subject areas addressed by the project.

- (5) Two representatives of the State Board of Education, one of whom is a classroom teacher in the subject areas addressed by the subject.
- (6) One representative selected by the Governor.
- (7) One representative selected by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.
- (8) One representative of the statewide professional organization of teachers in the subject matter addressed by the project, to be selected by the president of that organization. If there is more than one statewide professional organization of teachers in that subject area, the members of the advisory board may choose which organization shall select the representative and may choose to include a representative of one or more of the other organizations as nonvoting members of the advisory board.
- (9) Two representatives of the California community colleges selected by the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, one of whom is a faculty member in the subject matter area addressed by the project.
- (10) Two representatives of an independent postsecondary institution selected by the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities, one of whom is a member of the faculty in the discipline addressed by the project.

Commission Activity

The Commission has a member on the Concurrence Committee as well as members on some of the Advisory Member Boards of the various projects.

Fiscal Impact

SB 232 would not have any fiscal impact on the Commission's budget.

Relevant Commission Legislative Policies

<u>Policy 1:</u> The Commission supports legislation that proposes to maintain or establish high standards for the preparation of public school teachers and other educators in California and opposes legislation that would lower standards for teachers and other educators.

Organizational Positions

According to the Senate Floor analysis (June 5, 2007) the following have been noted as in support of the bill:

California Alliance for Arts Education

California Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance

California Association of Teachers of English

California Language Teachers Association

California State PTA University of California

There is no known opposition to the measure.

Reason for Suggested Position

The CSMP was established in 1988 to provide professional development to educators. AB 1734 (Mazzoni, Chap. 333, Stats. 1998) ensured that these projects would be consistent with the state's K-12 Academic Content Standards. The CSMP serves over 800 school districts in close to 100 sites statewide on campuses across the higher education segments. According to the UC, the projects annually provide training to over 40,000 teachers, administrators and university faculty.

In addition, the Concurrence Committee and the Advisory Board of each of the projects include a member from the Commission.

For these reasons, staff recommends a **Support** position on SB 232.

APPENDIX A

Legislative Guidelines And Possible Bill Positions

LEGISLATIVE GUIDELINES OF THE

CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING

Adopted February 3, 1995

- 1. The Commission supports legislation that proposes to maintain or establish high standards for the preparation of public school teachers and other educators in California and opposes legislation that would lower standards for teachers and other educators.
- 2. The Commission supports legislation that proposes to maintain or establish high standards of fitness and conduct for public school educators in California and opposes legislation that would lower standards of fitness or conduct for public school educators.
- 3. The Commission supports legislation that reaffirms that teachers and other educators have appropriate qualifications and experience for their positions, as evidenced by holding appropriate credentials, and opposes legislation that would allow unprepared persons to serve in the public schools.
- 4. The Commission supports the maintenance of a thoughtful, cohesive approach to the preparation of credential candidates and opposes legislation that would tend to fragment or undermine the cohesiveness of the preparation of credential candidates.
- 5. The Commission supports legislation that strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms that it previously has adopted and opposes legislation that would undermine initiatives or reforms that it previously has adopted.
- 6. The Commission supports alternatives to existing credential requirements that maintain high standards for the preparation of educators and opposes alternatives that do not provide sufficient assurances of quality.
- 7. The Commission opposes legislation that would give it significant additional duties and responsibilities if the legislation does not include an appropriate source of funding to support those additional duties and responsibilities.
- 8. The Commission supports legislation that affirms its role as an autonomous teacher standards board and opposes legislation that would erode the independence or authority of the Commission.

Possible Bill Positions for Commission Consideration

The Commission may adopt a position on each bill considered for action. The following chart describes the bill positions. The Commission may choose to change a position on a bill at any subsequent meeting.

Sponsor: Legislative concepts are adopted by the Commission and staff is directed to find an author for the bill and to aid the author's staff by providing background information and seeking support for the bill.

Support: The Commission votes to support a bill and directs staff to write letters of support to Legislative Committee members and to testify in support of the bill at Legislative Committee hearings. The Commission's support position will be recorded in the Legislative Committee's bill analysis. If the bill is successful in the Legislature, staff writes letters of support to the Governor.

Support if Amended: The Commission expresses support for the overall concept of a bill, but objects to one or more sections. The Commission votes to direct staff to contact the author with suggested amendments. If the bill is amended to reflect the Commission's recommendations, the Commission's position automatically becomes "Support."

Seek Amendments: The Commission expresses concern over one or more sections of the bill and votes to direct staff to contact the author with suggested amendments. If the bill is amended to reflect the Commission's recommendations, staff will inform the Commission at a subsequent meeting and ask if the Commission would like to adopt a new position.

Watch: The Commission expresses interest in the content of the bill but votes to direct staff to "watch" the bill for future amendments or for further movement through the Legislative process. Early in the Legislative session, the Commission may wish to adopt a "watch" position on bills that are not yet fully formed.

Oppose Unless Amended: The Commission objects strenuously to one or more sections of the bill and votes to direct staff to contact the author with suggested amendments. If the bill is not amended to reflect the Commission's recommendations, the Commission may vote to adopt an "Oppose" position at a subsequent meeting. If the bill is amended to reflect the Commission's recommendations, staff will inform the Commission at a subsequent meeting and ask if the Commission would like to adopt a new position.

Oppose: The Commission expresses opposition to the overall concept of a bill and votes to direct staff to write letters of opposition to Legislative Committee members and to testify in opposition to the bill at Legislative Committee hearings. The Commission's "oppose" position will be recorded in the Legislative Committee bill analysis. If the bill is successful in the Legislature, staff writes letters of opposition to the Governor.

No Position: The Commission may choose to delay taking a position on a bill and may vote to direct staff to bring the bill forward at a subsequent meeting. The Commission may also choose to direct staff not to bring the bill forward for further consideration.